

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated August, 8, 2006, has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 15-18, 20 and 21 are rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1, 2, 5-8, 15-18, 20 and 21 remain pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 6-8, 15, 16, 18, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,677,704 to Kusano et al. (hereinafter "Kusano"); claims 5, 17, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusano in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,775,891 to Aoki et al. (hereinafter "Aoki").

The rejection to claims 1, 2, 6-8, 15, 16, 18, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kusano is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested. Applicant submits that Kusano does not anticipate claims 1, 2, 6-8, 15, 16, 18, and 21 because Kusano does not disclose either inherently or explicitly, each and every element of the claims.

Claim 1 recites a method of driving a liquid crystal display, having a combination of features including "modulating source data of one frame period using registered data from a frame period previous to the one frame period and supplying the modulated data to a liquid crystal panel at an initial period of the one frame period; and applying data different from the modulated data to the liquid crystal panel at a later period of the one frame period."

Applicant submits that Kusano does not disclose at least "supplying the modulated data to a liquid crystal panel at an initial period of the one frame period; and applying data different from the modulated data to the liquid crystal panel at a later period of the one frame period." At Column 5, lines 56-61, Kusano states the following:

"The same image data is inputted from the three-color separating portion 24 three consecutive times, and the respective frame rate control portions 26R, 26G and 26B perform frame rate modulation for the inputted image data with one cycle being three frames. The frame rate modulation will be described later. The respective frame rate control portions 26R, 26G and 26B output different frame data (any one of the frame data of the first through third frames corresponding to a single image data) each time as a frame data for each color."

Applicant submits that Kusano describes a frame rate modulation scheme applied over a three frame period cycle and does not disclose “supplying the modulated data to a liquid crystal panel at an initial period of the one frame period; and applying data different from the modulated data to the liquid crystal panel at a later period of the one frame period.” Applicant submits that Kusano does not teach at least the above-identified combination of features of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Kusano.

Claim 7 recites an apparatus for driving a liquid crystal display including “a data provider alternatively applying the modulated data and data different from the modulated data to the liquid crystal panel within the one frame period.” In the Office Action, The Examiner rejects claim 7 using the same reasoning as given in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant submits that Kusano, including FIG. 3 as cited by the Examiner does not disclose “a data provider alternatively applying the modulated data and data different from the modulated data to the liquid crystal panel within the one frame period” as recited in claim 7. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 7 is not anticipated by Kusano.

Claim 18 recites a liquid crystal display including “a data provider alternatively applying the modulated source data and the source data to the liquid crystal panel through the data lines within the one frame period.” In the Office Action, The Examiner rejects claim 18 using the same reasoning as given in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant submits that Kusano, including FIG. 3 as cited by the Examiner does not disclose “a data provider alternatively applying the modulated source data and the source data to the liquid crystal panel through the data lines within the one frame period” as recited in claim 18. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 18 is not anticipated by Kusano.

Claim 21 recites a method of driving a liquid crystal display including “applying a modulated data signal to a liquid crystal panel within one frame period; and applying a data signal within the one frame period, wherein the modulated data signal has a voltage level larger than that of the data signal, and wherein the modulated data signal depends on data from a frame period previous to the one frame period.” In the Office Action, The Examiner rejects claim 21 using the same reasoning as given in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant submits that Kusano, including FIG. 3 as cited by the Examiner does not disclose “applying a modulated data signal to a liquid crystal panel within one frame period; and applying a data signal within the one frame

period, wherein the modulated data signal has a voltage level larger than that of the data signal, and wherein the modulated data signal depends on data from a frame period previous to the one frame period” as recited in claim 21. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is not anticipated by Kusano.

Applicant notes that claims 2 and 6 depend from claim 1 and that claims 8, 15, and 16 depend from claim 7. Claims 2, 6, 8, 15, and 16 each include all of the limitations of their respective base claims. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 2, 6, 8, 15, and 16 are not anticipated by Kusano at least by way of their dependencies from claims 1, 7, and 18.

The rejection to claims 5, 17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kusano in view of Aoki is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Applicant notes that claims 5, 17, and 20 depend respectively from independent claims 1, 7, and 18, and each includes by reference all of the limitations from the respective base claim. As discussed above, Kusano does not anticipate claims 1, 7, and 18.

The Examiner cites Aoki to cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Kusano with respect to image data display in two sub-frames. Applicant does not here reach the Examiner’s conclusion with regards to the teaching of Aoki. Applicant submits that Aoki does not cure the deficiencies in the teachings of Kusano with respect to elements of claims 1, 7, and 18 as identified and discussed above. Applicant submits that Kusano and Aoki, analyzed singly or in combination do not teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1, 7, and 18. Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1, 7, and 18 and claims 5, 17, and 20 depending respectively from claims 1, 7, and 18 are allowable over Kusano and Aoki.

Applicant believes the application is in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911. *A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.*

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 6, 2006

By Valerie P. Hayes
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No. 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant